

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-24 are pending. Independent claims 1, 14, 16, and 21 are amended to specify that each of the plurality of individual computer devices each has a processor and that each non-volatile storage device is divided into a first storage area reserved for files used by the processor of the corresponding computer device for its normal operation and which is inaccessible to other processors outside the individual computer device except via the processor of that computer entity. The basis for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0057] of the published application.

The claims are also amended for proper antecedent basis; to preclude interpretation under 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph; and to assure infringement of the apparatus claims at the time the goods are sold prior to being put into use.

Applicants traverse the double-patenting rejection. In a concurrently filed Amendment, the claims of copending Application Serial No. 09/876,161 are amended so there is a clear line between the claims of each application.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-24 as being anticipated by Klostermann (EP 0 854 423).

The amendment of the independent claims emphasizes that the present invention relates to a plurality of substantially

independent computing entities connected over a conventional network rather than processors forming a distributed computing environment. Klostermann is concerned with distributed data processing systems where each of platforms 2-5 operates a like set of processing operations (see column 5, lines 30-34) that contribute to the overall data processing of the system (see column 3, lines 2 and 3), i.e.. they all work together to achieve a shared result/service. Therefore, in a distributed computing environment the platforms 2 - 5 are not separate, single logical data processing entities. Therefore, Klostermann fails to disclose this feature of the amended Claims. Further, as described at column 7, lines 20-34, of Klostermann, if one of platforms 2-5 fails then one of the other platforms has direct access to the copy of the data. Therefore, Klostermann does not disclose a first data storage area for storing files for the normal operation of the corresponding computer device which are inaccessible to other processors outside the computer entity except via the processor of that computer entity. As a result, claims 14, 14, 16, and 21 distinguish over Klostermann.

Applicants also traverse the rejection of claims 7 and 13 as being obvious as a result of Klostermann in view of Sharman (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,310). Sharman obviously fails to overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Klostermann. In addition, Sharman (US 5,586,310) also relates to distributed data processing systems, in

ordinary skill in the art to devise a data protection scheme for computers in the system and method of claims 7 and 13.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are deemed in order.

To the extent necessary during prosecution, Applicants hereby request any required extension of time not otherwise requested and hereby authorize the Examiner to charge any required fees not otherwise provided for, including extension of time and extra claims fees, to Deposit Account No. 07-1337.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP**

By: 

Allan M. Lowe, Reg. No. 19,641

**Filed: July 13, 2004**

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300

Alexandria, VA 22314

703-684-1111 telephone

703-518-5499 telecopier

AML:rk